



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,895	12/27/2000	Yueheng Xu	INTL-0403-US(P8986)	5241

7590 01/13/2005

Timothy N. Trop
TROP PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,895

Applicant(s)

XU, YUEHENG

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment, filed on 08/09/2004, has been entered. Claims 1-25 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-21 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, Patent No. 5,157,905 and further in view of Taieb, Patent No. 6,718,519.

4. As to claims 1, 11 and 21, Powell discloses a method comprising:

receiving a file including characters (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14 and Fig. 6:receiving an input digital document and identify the character set and language of the digital document);

converting the characters of said file to a first code format if the characters are of a first type (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14: if the digital document representation is in a Latin-based byte character set, then generate a three-

Art Unit: 2176

dimensional characterization (first code format) of the digital document using Table 1; and

converting the characters of said file to a second code format if said characters are of a second type (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14: if the digital document representation is in a multiple byte character set, then generate a two-dimensional characterization (second code) using the mapping in Table 4).

However, Powell does not explicitly disclose displaying the characters of the file using the first code format or the second code format. In the same field of endeavor, Taieb discloses a multilingual text file is decomposed into segments, the invention looks up the preloaded list of system fonts to select the appropriate font (format) for each segments, and then the entire text is displayed with appropriate font for each segment (Fig. 7 and col. 7, line 47 – col. 8, line 51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Taieb and Powell to include displaying characters of the file using the first code format or the second code format in order to solve fundamental problem when trying to accommodate multilingual output.

5. As to claims 3 and 13, Powell-Taieb disclose checking to determine whether a character set plane is changed (Powell, col. 13, line 38 – col. 15, line 2: detecting the characters/language of the segment of the digital document to be the single language script range).

6. As to claims 4 and 14, Powell-Taieb disclose wherein if the character set plane is changed, inserting a new character set designator (Powell, col. 13, line 38 – col. 15, line 2 and col. 15, line 47 – col. 16, line 18: if the characters/language of the segment of the digital is not single language script range, then it must be a multiple language script range, and assign source code value to a unique target value (character)).

7. As to claims 5 and 15, Powell-Taieb disclose determining whether the characters in the file are defined according to the first code format (Powell, col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 55: detecting the characters in the digital document means determines whether the digital document is expressed in a Latin-based single byte character (first code format)).

8. As to claims 6, 16 and 23, Powell-Taieb disclose wherein if said characters are coded according to said first code format, table mapping Unicode values to said first code format (Powell, col. 14, lines 15-38 and Table 5).

9. As to claims 7, 17 and 24, Powell-Taieb disclose wherein if said first code format is not utilized, using the surrogate area of Unicode (Powell, col. 14, line 40 – col. 15, line 2 and Table 5).

Art Unit: 2176

10. As to claims 8 and 18, Powell discloses the limitations as discussed above. However, Powell does not explicitly disclose using a surrogate value to find a font file location and offset. Taieb discloses a message is received, and each character of each portion of the message is evaluated, a linked list of available system fonts matching each character of the each portion of the message is created to determine which font is most suitable to render each portion of the message (col. 5, line 1 – col. 6, line 64 and col. 7, lines 47-52). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Taieb and Powell to include a surrogate value to find a font file location and offset so that the text of the message would be displayed correctly.

11. As to claims 9 and 19, Powell and Taieb disclose dividing font files into planes (Taieb, Fig. 3: character font files in different script files, and the motivation of Taieb's system is to identify the language or character set being used in the data so that a best match to available output fonts may be made).

As to claims 10, 20 and 25, Powell and Taieb disclose selectively determining a font for a particular character from plane, row and column information or from surrogate Unicode information (Taieb, Fig. 3: the motivation of Taieb's system is to identify the language or character set being used in the data so that a best match to available output fonts may be made).

Art Unit: 2176

12. Claims 2, 12 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell and Taieb as applied to claims 1, 3-11, 13-21 and 23-25 above, and further in view of Lincke et al. (Lincke), Patent No. 6,397,259.

13. As to claims 2, 12 and 22, Powell-Taieb disclose receiving a digital document (web page) in a plane and row format (col. 13, lines 4-15: digital document representation into segments (rows). However, Powell does not explicitly disclose a web in a plane, row and column format. Lincke discloses web pages includes graphic, text, frame, tables (columns and rows), form, etc... (col. 3, lines 6-33 and col. 21, line 65 – col. 22, line 8). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lincke and Powell-Taieb to include a web page in a plane, row and column format in order to provide user friendly environment for web users.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 08/09/2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., displaying the characters of the file using the first code format or the second code format) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Art Unit: 2176

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am – 5:00 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER